

EVERGREEN • EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

Summary of Task Force Meeting September 21, 2005

The third meeting of the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy Task Force was held on September 21, 2005 at the San José City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street, Wing 118, San José. Eileen Goodwin, meeting facilitator, called the session to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m. A copy of the meeting agenda, provided to all Task Force members, is available on the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy website at:

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/agenda/2Agenda09-21-05.pdf>

Task Force Members Present:

Chair Dave Cortese, Vice-Chair Nora Campos, Sylvia Alvarez, Jenny Chang, Steven Cox, Alan Covington, Nancy Dellamattera, Steve Dunn, Joe Head, Mike Hill, Bob Levy, Maria Lopez, Felipe Juarez, Lou Kvitek, Gordon Lund, Khanh Nguyen, Melanie Richardson, Al Munoz, George Perez, J. Manuel Herrera, Vince Songcayawon, Ike White, Rob Wooten, Homing Yip, Dave Zenker, Chris Corpus, Jim Zito

Members of the Public Present:

George Reilly, Joe Shyy, Wesley Lee, James Kawamoto, Kelly Erardi, George Silvestri, Kulwant Sidhu, George Redenbaugh, Jim Smith, Jim Crawford, Clif Black, Alan Garofalo, Bob Rivet, John Diffenderfer, Bob Gill, Terry Gotcher, Ellie Glass, Shawna Sanders, Rhonda Garcia, Ivy Jarratt, Susan Mineta, Anita Vanhall, Carlos DaSilva, Mark Lazzarini, Dustin DeRollo, Sean Charpentier, Katja Irvin

Developer Community Present:

Bo Radanovich, Gerry DeYoung, Jim Eller, Tom Armstrong, Mike Keaney, Patrick Spillane, Gretchen Sauer

Staff Present:

Laurel Prevetti, Rabia Chaudhry, Louansee Moua, Christine Silva Burnett, Manuel Pineda, Dave Mitchell, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Cindy Ho

Welcome and Introductions: Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies

Ms. Goodwin reviewed the evening's agenda. Chairperson Cortese introduced Louansee Moua, Chief of Staff to Madison Nguyen, recently elected to the San José City Council.

The Task Force Members and members of the public were reminded to validate their parking tickets at the machine provided.

Ms. Goodwin explained that the public comment portion of the agenda would now be utilizing speaker cards. Members of the public were encouraged to fill out requests to speak and to hand them in at anytime during the meeting.

Approval of August 31, 2005 Task Force Meeting Summary:

Copies of the summary of the Task Force meeting held on August 31, 2005 were provided to the Task Force members. It was agreed that the meeting summary accurately summarized the August 31 meeting.

Approval of September 6, 2005 Community Meeting Summary:

Copies of the summary of the General Community Meeting held on September 6, 2005 were provided to the Task Force members. It was agreed that the meeting summary accurately summarized the September 6 Community Meeting.

Announcements:

Ms. Goodwin advised Task Force members that there would be a special training on Brown Act issues on October 3, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. The meeting will be held at San José City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street, San José.

Outreach Calendar: Task Force members were provided copies of the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy Outreach Calendar (9/21/05 Forward). The Calendar shows the currently scheduled regular meetings of the Task Force, General Community meetings, public events and presentations concerning the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy, and other public outreach efforts to be undertaken through June 2006. A copy of the updated Outreach Calendar is available on the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy website at:
<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/outreach.asp>

Environmental Review: Laurel Prevetti, City of San José; Manuel Pineda, California Department of Transportation

Laurel Prevetti, City of San José, gave an overview of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Manuel Pineda, City of San José's Department of Transportation, then presented preliminary traffic study results for the Study Area. Mr. Pineda provided Task Force members with a print copy of his presentation materials. A copy of the presentation is available on the Evergreen•East Hills Vision Strategy website at:
<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/pdf/DRAFTtranspPres9-21-05.pdf>.
There followed questions and comments from Task Force members, with responses from Ms. Prevetti and Mr. Pineda.

Comment/Question	Response/Answer
Were other roads studied? Was removing HOV lanes considered?	Yes, but preliminary results don't show that level of detail only the levels of service "E" or "F" from the Evergreen area.
On the handout, what are the "Approved Improvements?"	The Approved development includes existing but not developed entitlements as well as changes as a result of the LRT project. Approved is Scenario 1.
Traffic improvements are not in here. The goal should be to make it better than the current situation, not worse.	The traffic improvements will be fully defined in the final EIR.
This analysis is the same as what was done a year ago.	The scenarios are different; no line-by-line comparison of the current document to the prior work has been done.
Traffic is terrible today; what is the volume to capacity ratio?	There is no more capacity on Capitol Expressway.
Is there a study planned to look at White Road?	The transportation study will spread out and included major and minor roadways.
In the traffic analysis done in May 2004, issues were raised as to the trip generation rate of new development. The old trip generation number was unrealistic given the large size of the new homes.	The comment is noted.
Does the Background include Edenvale?	Yes, that is correct.
Is this preliminary?	Yes.
E & F are heavy?	Yes.
Is the Evergreen policy more strict?	The impact criteria is different; it is tighter than the citywide criteria. This summary sheet is E & F only, but other letters will be in the EIR.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

So, heavy traffic is acceptable?

Yes, levels "A" through "D" are acceptable.

Is the Coyote Valley EIR taken into account? It should be.

Yes, other projects which might affect the Evergreen•East Hills area will be looked at. Coyote could be in an option.

Clarification of table. Please clarify Scenarios 2 through 5.

Hard to distinguish.

Please describe the "snapshot."

The snapshot is of the worst hours of traffic, the morning and afternoon peak traffic hours. There was no weekend traffic in this analysis, it is not in the database.

What is the timing of the EIR?

January 2006.

Chairperson Cortese said, Positive and negative impacts of weekend traffic should be looked at; Saturday is as bad as a Friday now. May be off-set in trade-off.

Noted.

What would it take to include weekend traffic in the study?

That would be difficult. The database of traffic flows is limited and the City of San José does not maintain weekend information.

The Level of Service categories are confusing; why no weekends.

Information will be provided by staff directly to the questioner.

Vice-Chair Campos asked, What does it take to get the weekend traffic information measured?

City of San José staff will analyze that and report back to the Task Force.

In the Pleasant Hills analysis, please include Flint, and Tully to Martin.

Noted.

Compared to the morning and afternoon during the week, how would weekend change things?

The worst traffic is in the morning between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. and in the afternoon between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.

First Draft of Evergreen Development Policy: Andrew Crabtree, City of San José

Andrew Crabtree, City of San José, provided Task Force members a copy of the Draft Evergreen Development Policy, City of San José Working Draft, September 2005. A copy of the draft Development Policy, and other related documents, is available from the Evergreen-East Hills Vision Strategy website at:

http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/dev_policy.asp. Mr. Crabtree noted that the document is an early draft. He noted that the City can have specific standards that are unique to an area and that the City is looking to adopt a set of standards that work specifically for the Evergreen East Hills area.

There are two phasing options presented in the Draft Development Policy. The first option came out of the work of the prior task force, reorganized by City staff to account for funding issues. The second option is the exact proposal of the prior task force. Under both options, phasing of development and construction of amenities are linked and tied together. Mr. Crabtree asked Task Force members for their input as to the two proposed phasing options, both the specific options set out and the underlying policy considerations. Mr. Crabtree also indicated additional scenarios could be developed. Task Force comments and staff responses follow:

Comment/Question

Response/Answer

On page 11 of the Draft Development Policy, it states that the additional analysis of traffic impacts is not anticipated to be necessary; does that really mean no more traffic analysis?

Yes, if future development is consistent with the final Development Policy. However, there site-specific operational traffic studies may still be required.

Is the Capitol corridor eligible for “protected intersection” status under the new Policy? That would be a lot of Level of Service “F” status.

There are more impacts to the boundary areas. Protection of the intersections would be a City Council decision.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

Future discussion at Task Force meetings needs to examine affordable housing and job quality. Task Force members need to understand the overall future commercial and residential development and how to create opportunities and have good jobs. The trade-off analysis is useful to look at and understand the demand for affordable housing. Need to look at the overall stock of affordable housing stock and levels, the impact of job quality in the conversion of industrial to residential development. How will the changes to land use affect the quality of jobs? Need answers at the next meeting.

Comment noted.

The draft policy seems to put 25% more housing on less land. There will be significant traffic impacts. Level of Service "F" is unacceptable. This policy does not have a cap and it needs one. As to funding, "pay up front" was the recommendation of the old task force; now it has changed to better than developers could have hoped to expect.

Comment noted.

Need to take into account demographics. The potential residents are not telecommuters. Bike trails are not realistic amenities. Amenities need to be better spread out; they are grouped in the South.

Comment noted.

What is Task Force input process? This is too subjective. Where is the study?

The traffic study will be part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

Capitol corridor is eligible versus the existing policy. Disconnect. A lot can happen. Need to understand this.

This is the first opportunity for Task Force members to provide their comments and suggestions. All these points will be on the Task Force agenda.

With respect to Phase 1 funding – the City is deliberately delaying Phase 1. That phase can be built now and, in fact, one new park has already been built. What is the reason for this?

Comment noted.

There is an inconsistency in the allocation pools (residential, commercial and industrial; page 10 of the Draft Policy) with the traffic impact fee discussion (pages 21 and 22 of the Draft Policy). Those should be consistent.

Good comment. Staff will review.

Are the community amenities in the development policy set in stone?

No. The City Council will be the ultimate decision makers based upon staff and task force input. This document is a first draft for discussion purposes.

Why campus industrial either zero or four thousand, with nothing in-between?

The scenarios are bracketed and identify only the outer boundaries.

Happy to be here; we have a lot more time. However, feel have been sold a “case of snake oil.” Specifically, Page 11 of the Draft Development Policy (Traffic Impacts) implies everything is “O.K.” which it is not. On Page 12, whether traffic is heavy or super heavy, how do flowers make it better? I’m insulted; this is being shoved at us. I’m on the outside but I’m concerned. Can’t go forward with the jar full. I need to be brought along; schooled.

Comment noted.

Is staff available for “off-line” discussions?

Andrew Crabtree is the contact person and is available for discussions concerning the draft development policy.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

Vice Chair Campos said, O.K. with discussions about clarification of the policy, but not with changes to the policy. Changes have to be done in public. Maybe we need to have more meetings.

Comment noted.

Schools Issues: Laurel Prevetti, City of San José

Ms. Prevetti reviewed with Task Force members the schools information received to date. Ms. Prevetti provided to Task Force members a one page summary of schools discussions originally generated by the prior Evergreen Visioning Process task force. A copy of that summary, along with other documents, is available from the Evergreen-East Hills Vision Strategy website at: <http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/schools.asp>. Ms Prevetti also mentioned that there were additional school documents on the website. Ms. Prevetti noted that the City of San José is working to convene a “staff to staff” working group with the potentially affected school districts to continue discussions about school impacts. After her presentation, Ms. Prevetti asked for input from Task Force members to assist City staff as they enter further discussions with school districts.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

Regarding the Evergreen Elementary School site, is a combination at the site possible?

Yes, reconfiguration of the current middle school is possible.

There is an update in process on demographics in the Eastside school districts. It is hoped that this will be completed in November 2005. There is overall capacity to absorb an additional 1,000 students. However, the situation is complicated because some schools are gaining students (such as Evergreen High School) while others are losing (Lick, Overfelt). There are policy questions about boundaries, capacity balancing, “third rail issues,” and financing that need to be addressed. These are difficult issues to weigh.

Comment noted.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

There is a community organization in existence because of high school capacity issues. Evergreen High School is impacted and Silver Creek High School has deteriorated. This is a very sensitive issue where pressure needs to be brought upon the School District. Capacity and boundaries need to be addressed.

Comment noted.

Clifton Black is the new Evergreen School District Superintendent.

Comment noted.

Ten to twelve acres for a new middle school site is insufficient; need seventeen or more acres to meet the needs of a middle school without severe issues.

Comment noted.

Need to understand the correlation of old numbers and new numbers.

Comment noted.

Final Market Study Findings: Nancy Klein, City of San José, Office of Economic Development; Jonathan Stern, Bay Area Economics

Nancy Klein of the City of San José Office of Economic Development, provided an overview of the final Market Study completed with respect to the Evergreen East Hills area. Ms. Klein provided Task Force members a copy of the final Evergreen Area Retail Study, dated September 13, 2005, a copy of which is available, along with related documents, on the Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy website at:

http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning/evergreen/retail_study.asp. After discussing the context of the Retail Study, Ms. Klein introduced Jonathan Stern of Bay Area Economics, the consulting firm which co-authored the study. Mr. Stern covered for the Task Force the basic findings of the study, including it's leakage analysis, demographics findings, and the undersupply of local and regional serving stores. Task Force members provided the following comments on the final Retail Study.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

The study is very interesting. It seems to have been pulled from a database, not a study. Local trade areas are questionable. The definition of "trade area" on Page 6 is then violated. This is artificially divided, Evergreen is diverse and has wide spending patterns. This is not considered. On Page 33, in Table 13, the Area 5 Industrial Area: Grocery store, Lunardi's is 30% of what they expected. This is catering to special interests.

Comment noted.

Those nice businesses should be in Eastridge, not Arcadia. 100,000 square feet is o.k., 300,000 square feet is not.

Comment noted.

Land outside the area that is zoned retail; why is that not developed now?

Staff is not aware of any commercial sites that are not currently developed.

College is encouraged with the study.

Comment noted.

Every house as an impact on the service sector on General Fund. What is the balance needed to support this from retail?

Comment noted.

Public Comments**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

This is an overburdened agenda. Schools and traffic need time. The public needs answers to questions. Went to the December 2004 meeting Ms. Prevetti is referring to; it was rushed. Agenda is too fast. Need all night on levels of service, all night on schools, another night on retail, etc.

Comment noted.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

With respect to schools, Evergreen High School is at or beyond capacity already. Teachers are in the lounges, etc. Next year there will be a lottery for the area school. A boundary change is not likely. Mount Pleasant is also impacted. Where will the kids go to high school? People who live in Evergreen do not shop at Eastridge; they shop at Oakridge which is marketed to them. With regard to traffic, Homing is right on. Traffic won't get better.

Comment noted.

A speaker who worked for Shappell Industries on the Evergreen Village Center stated opposition to the Evergreen Community College site shopping center. Lunardi's was a huge risk for Shappell and they would not have taken that risk except in reliance on the General Plan. The Evergreen Village Center is special and has been invested in heavily. Shappell was assured there would be no new grocery store, especially from the Community College, this is in documentation. Shappell has kept its word and commitment and will oppose this. The speaker recommended peer review.

Comment noted.

Comment/Question**Response/Answer**

The General Counsel for Lunardi's was concerned about the validity of the report and asked whether it will be in CEQA process. He could not get an answer from staff in prior discussions. The assumptions are nonsense – the focus should be on the business you have. He hasn't yet scrutinized the dollar figures. Lunardi's is family owned, seven markets. In 1999, Lunardi's was given certain assurances and committed significant money. This is likely to be the last time to build from the ground up. Windshield drive-by study is embarrassing.

Comment noted.

Traffic is horrible on weekends. 300,000 square feet in Arcadia is too much even for a developer. Traffic at a Level of Service "F" is unacceptable. The Community is concerned they are going to get a project dumped on them.

Comment noted.

Adjourn

After the public comment, several Task Force members had comments and suggestion for future meetings:

A Task Force member suggested a working session on policy issues from the School Districts.

Is the Task Force open to having Lunardi's give a presentation to the entire Task Force?

Councilmember Cortese, in response to the prior question about a Lunardi's presentation, stated that the Task Force would have to look at its future agendas and factor that in; suggesting that a future agenda could be adjusted.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:10 p.m. The next Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy Task Force meeting is scheduled for October 19, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. at San José City Hall.

Prepared By: Eileen Goodwin

Distribution: Attendees